DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 394 08 SP 004 470

AUTHOR	Arnold, Daniel S.; Van Tassel, Carol
TITLE	Seminar for Supervisors and Teacher Educators of Teachers of Persons with Special Needs. Final Report, Phase II
INSTITUTION	Kentucky Univ., Lexington.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-7-0527
PUB DATE	Dec 68
GRANT	OEG-1-7-070527-3543
NOTE	44p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.30
DESCRIPTORS	*Program Evaluation, *Special Education, *Teacher Educator Education, *Teacher Orientation, *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This report describes the evaluation phase of a 2-week seminar held at the University of Kentucky on June 12-23, 1967, and designed for supervisors and teacher educators of teachers of persons with special needs. The general objective of the seminar was to orient persons in leadership positions in vocational education to the characteristics, problems, and educational needs of persons with special needs. The report includes a description of the methods of evaluation, a presentation of the evaluation findings, and a section containing the conclusions. Five evaluation activities were involved, including pretest, posttest, daily guideline reports, individual projects, participant evaluation questionnaires, and a detailed follow-up survey. On the basis of the evaluation, it was concluded that the participants benefited professionally from having attended the seminar, and that the outcomes justified the time and effort expended by the seminar staff and the host institution. (Author/MBM)

ED044394

FINAL REPORT
(Phase Two)

Project No. 7-0527
Grant No. OEG-1-7-070527-3543

SEMINAR FOR SUPERVISORS AND TEACHER EDUCATORS OF TEACHERS OF PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Daniel S. Arnold
Carol Van Tassel

University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

December 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SP004470

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
SUMMARY		1
INTRODUCTION		2
	Type of Program	
	Evaluation Rationale	
	Methods of Evaluation	
FINDINGS		5
	Pretest - Post test	
	Daily Guideline Report	
	Individual Projects	
	Participant Evaluation	
	Participant Follow-up Survey	
CONCLUSIONS		14

APPENDICES

Appendix		
A	Participant Evaluation Survey Instrument	16
B	Participant Follow-up Survey - Form A	18
C	Participant Follow-up Survey - Form B	21
D	Case Studies of Ten Seminar Participants	24
E	Follow-up Survey Participants	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Evaluation of Time Allocated to Various Seminar Activities	6
II	Intensity of Value of Two Seminar Activities--Consultants and Field Trips . .	7
III	Summary of Seminar Trainee Participation in Activities Relating to Persons With Special Needs	11

A. SUMMARY

This report describes the evaluation phase of a two-week seminar that was designed for supervisors and teacher educators of teachers of persons with special needs. The seminar was held June 12-23, 1967, on the campus of the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. The general objective of the seminar was to orient persons in leadership positions in vocational education to the characteristics, problems, and educational needs of persons with special needs.

Included in this report are a description of the methods of evaluation, a presentation of the evaluation findings, and a section containing the conclusions.

There were five evaluation activities involved in the study. Included in the activities were a detailed follow-up survey and a participant evaluation questionnaire.

On the basis of the evaluation, it was concluded that the participants benefitted professionally from having attended the seminar, and that the outcomes justified the time and efforts expended on the part of the seminar staff and the host institution. It was suggested that the outcomes justified the financial and supervisory support provided by the U. S. Office of Education.

B. INTRODUCTION

1. Type of Program

This report describes the evaluation phase of a two-week seminar that was designed for supervisory and teacher educators of teachers of persons with special needs.[1] The seminar program was planned to develop knowledges about, understandings of and empathy for persons with special needs, and to provide a basis for conceptualizing guidelines for professional vocational education personnel working in the area of persons with special needs.

Prior to a presentation of the evaluation of the seminar, it would be helpful to review its objectives:

1. Bring to the attention of persons involved in preparing teachers for vocational education programs the problems, differences, and strengths among persons who have academic, social, economic, and other handicaps which prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program.
2. Recognize the cultural systems, value systems, and personality systems of persons with special needs.
3. Explore techniques for conceptualizing the problems of persons with special needs.
4. Experience through participant observation the social situation of persons with special needs.
5. Establish the concept that special methods and materials are necessary in designing effective vocational programs for persons with special needs.
6. Explore the possibilities in program development to serve persons with special needs.
7. Emphasize the contribution that vocational guidance can make in assisting disadvantaged youth and adults with their problems.
8. Discover feasible means of recruiting potentially effective teachers.

---

[1]The seminar was held June 12-23, 1967, on the campus of the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

9. Explore possible administrative organizational procedures for adapting educational programs for persons with special needs.
10. Develop techniques for working with the leaders of local school systems in implementing programs for persons with special needs.
11. Explore ways of working with the leaders of community institutions, organizations, agencies, special committees, etc.
12. Develop "working guidelines" to assist supervisors and teacher educators in program planning and implementation. (Guidelines will be disseminated to all persons having interest in developing vocational education programs for persons with special needs as well as having responsibility in this area.)
13. Recognize the contribution that successful programs for persons with special needs can make to such individuals and to society.

2. Evaluation Rationale

As with most projects, evaluation was considered a most vital process to the outcomes of the seminar. Although there were many questions to be answered through the evaluation, the three general concerns were as follows:

a. Did the seminar participants benefit professionally from attending the seminar?
b. Did the outcomes of the seminar justify the time and effort the seminar staff and host institution expended?
c. Did the outcomes of the seminar justify the financial and supervisory support provided by the U. S. Office of Education?

3. Methods of Evaluation

Since evaluation was considered a major part of the total seminar project, five major types of evaluation activities were employed. They are briefly described as follows:

a. Pretest -- Post test. This activity was designed to measure changes in the understanding of concepts

associated with persons with special needs. These tests were administered during the first and final sessions of the seminar.[2]

b. Daily Guideline Report. Each day a committee of five of the participants summarized and edited the day's intellectual endeavors and submitted the resulting generalizations in written report form to the seminar director. An edited compilation of these daily reports became an important output of the seminar.

c. Individual Projects. Each participant was encouraged to develop an individual project relevant to his area of responsibility. The status of development of these projects at the end of the seminar was to be incorporated in the evaluation.

d. Participant Evaluation. Following the seminar, an evaluation questionnaire was mailed to each participant. The objective of this questionnaire was to gain the participants' assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of each phase of the seminar activities.[3]

e. Follow-up Survey. Perhaps the most significant evaluation activity of the effectiveness of the seminar was the follow-up survey that was conducted twelve months from the closing of the seminar. Each participant was contacted and asked to report his activities relating to persons with special needs during the past year. Ten of the participants were randomly selected and studied in greater detail. Case studies of their activities were compiled.[4]

---

[2]Copies of the instruments employed to collect this information appear in Appendices G and H respectively of Final Report (Phase One) of this project.

[3]A copy of the questionnaire employed to collect this data appears in Appendix A, Page 16.

[4]Copies of the questionnaires employed to collect this data appear as follows:

Appendix B, Page 18: Form A, used with the non-case-study subjects. Appendix C, Page 21: Form B, used with the case-study subjects.

C. FINDINGS

Although the results of some of the early evaluation activities were reported at an earlier date, they will again be summarized in order to present a complete description of the evaluation.

1. Pretest -- Post test

A pretest and a post test were administered respectively during the first and final sessions of the seminar. The seminar staff was pleased with the results of the testing program and felt that it reflected favorably on the content of the seminar. Tabulation of the test scores revealed the following:

Improvement in score	68%
No change in score	21%
Decrease in score	11%

It is interesting to note that in the majority of cases in which the pretest and post test scores were the same, the individual pretest score was high.

2. Daily Guideline Report

Each day of the seminar, a committee of five of the participants summarized and evaluated the day's intellectual endeavors and submitted the resulting generalizations in the form of a written report to the seminar director. These guidelines were duplicated and disseminated to the participants on the following day. The reports were generally of high quality and an edited summary of the daily reports became the most important output of the seminar.[5]

3. Individual Projects

Each participant was encouraged to develop a project relevant to his area of responsibility. (Participants with similar interests worked as a group.) Most of the participants made significant progress on their projects during the seminar. Several completed first drafts. Many others completed problem statements and outlines. Some submitted problem statements. The

---

[5]An edited summary of the daily guideline reports appears in Appendix A of Final Report (Phase One) of this project.

seminar staff was satisfied with the quality and quantity of these projects.[6]

4. Participant Evaluation

Four months following the close of the seminar a questionnaire designed to ascertain the participants' assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of each phase of the seminar was mailed to each of the participants.[7] Questionnaires and follow-up letters were sent to the 39 participants, but only 24 were returned. The questionnaire was designed to be anonymous.

The first series of questions regarded the amount of time allotted to the various activities of the seminar. The responses are summarized below:

TABLE I

EVALUATION OF TIME ALLOCATED TO VARIOUS SEMINAR ACTIVITIES
(N = 24)

Type of Work	Recommended Amount of Time			
	Greater	Same	Less	No Response
Formal Presentations by Consultants	0	16	7	1
Discussions with Consultants	17	4	2	1
Project Work	13	6	5	0

As the table above indicates, the majority of the participants indicated that the scheduled time allotted to formal presentations by consultants was very satisfactory. Seven suggested a lesser amount of time should have been devoted to this

---

[6]A list of project titles appears in Appendix D of Final Report (Phase One) of this project.

[7]A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix A, Page 16.

activity and none suggested the allotment of a greater amount of time. Seventeen of the participants indicated that a greater amount of time allotted to discussion sessions with the consultants would have been desirable. Two suggested a lesser amount of time, and four thought the time that had been allocated in the schedule was adequate.

The majority of the participants also suggested that a greater amount of time should have been devoted to individual and group project work. Six indicated the scheduled time was satisfactory and five suggested a lesser amount of time would have been adequate.

The participants were asked to indicate the intensity of contribution the various activities made to the seminar. The results are summarized below:

TABLE II

INTENSITY OF VALUE OF TWO SEMINAR ACTIVITIES --
CONSULTANTS AND FIELD TRIPS
(N = 24)

Activity	Intensity of Value				
	Great	Some	Little	No	No Response
Consultants	18	3	2	0	1
Field Trips	14	7	2	1	0

As the table above indicates, a majority of the participants indicated that both of the activities, presentations by consultants and field trips, were of great value. It is even more interesting to note that in each case, twenty-one of the responses fell on the positive side of the continuum.

The participants were asked which of the following alternatives they would recommend regarding the scheduling of consultants:

(a) more consultants and give them less time

(b) about the same number of consultants

(c) fewer consultants and give them more time

Two of the twenty-four respondents recommended response (a); eleven respondents recommended response (b); eleven respondents recommended response (c).

The seminar participants were also asked to indicate their recommendations regarding the number of field trips taken during the seminar. Four recommended more field trips; fifteen recommended about the same number of field trips; five recommended fewer field trips.

Perhaps the most significant question included in the questionnaire was as follows:

"Would you advise a colleague to enroll in a similar seminar?"

Twenty-two of the participants responded "yes." Only one participant responded negatively, and one participant did not respond.

Two additional open-ended questions were included in the questionnaire. The questions and the summarized results appear below:

Q - What do you consider the most valuable thing you learned during the seminar?

	Participants' Response	Frequency
1.	Formal and informal exchange of ideas with participants	10
2.	Definition of and characteristics of persons with special needs	6
3.	Guidelines for establishing special needs programs	5
4.	Need for curricula revision; special techniques and materials	3
5.	One must identify with individual students	3
6.	Do not remold students in your personal value system	3

7.	No special needs student is a complete educational loss	2
8.	The concepts relevant to teacher preparation	2
9.	The field trips	2
10.	Experiences of the consultants who worked directly with persons with special needs	2
11.	The literature	1
12.	Rural-urban comparisons	1
13.	How so many varied people can cooperate so well	1
14.	How not to run a seminar	1
15.	The integration of various disciplines	1

Q - We would appreciate any additional comments about the seminar, and any suggestions that you may have for planning future seminars.

	Participants' Response	Frequency
1.	More time to work on special projects	5
2.	Nights off	3
3.	Select more consultants who have direct contact with persons with special needs	2
4.	Provide more direct contact with persons with special needs and the agencies that serve them	2
5.	A well-rounded seminar	2
6.	Staff provided a relaxed atmosphere during the entire seminar	2
7.	Organization - good	2
8.	Terminate with a speaker the calibre of the keynoter	1
9.	House participants in close proximity	1
10.	Have more such seminars to reach more people	1
11.	Outstanding facility	1
12.	Can't be improved - I liked it	1
13.	More emphasis on national information	1
14.	No Saturday trips	1
15.	Less formality	1
16.	Younger person as a leader	1
17.	Do not try to sell Kentucky education	1
18.	Commendable work by sponsors	1
19.	More participant contact with consultants	1

5. Participant Follow-up Survey

Each of the seminar participants was mailed a follow-up questionnaire approximately one year following the seminar. The instrument was designed to gather information regarding each participant's activities relating to persons with special needs during the past year.[8] It had been assumed that the effectiveness of the seminar would be reflected in the future activities of the participants. Ten of the participants were randomly selected and studied in greater detail.

Two mailings were utilized in this survey, and thirty-six of the possible thirty-nine replies were received. Ten received the elongated case-study form, and all ten responded. Thus, the three participants who did not respond received the short form of the questionnaire. The survey results presented below are based on the thirty-six participants who responded.

Twenty-two of the participants who responded were employed in the same position they held a year ago. Of the fourteen who have changed employment since the seminar, ten individuals remained in a position that related to serving persons with special needs; three were employed in unrelated positions and one individual did not indicate whether or not his new position related to serving persons with special needs.

The survey instrument requested information regarding individual activities associated with serving persons with special needs. A summary of participation in these activities appears on the following page, Table III.

As the table indicates, a majority of the seminar participants engaged in a variety of activities regarding persons with special needs. Program development for persons with special needs was one of the areas studied. As the table indicates, thirty-one individuals participated in this activity. Of the thirty-one participants, nineteen participated in the development of more than one program for persons with special needs. The programs

---

[8]Copies of the questionnaires employed to collect this data appear as follows:

Appendix B, Page 18 : Form A, used with the non-case-study subjects. Appendix C, Page 21 : Form B, used with the case-study subjects.

TABLE III

SUMMARY OF SEMINAR TRAINEE PARTICIPATION IN
ACTIVITIES RELATING TO PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Activity	Number Participating	Number Not Participating	No Response	Total
Program Development	31	4	1	36
Teacher Training Program Development	19	17	0	36
Speaking Engagements Special Presentations	31	5	0	36
Organized Groups and Workshops	21	14	1	36
Dissemination of Information	29	7	0	36
Conference Attendance	23	13	0	36

varied in form and content. Summarized, they included mobile vocational programs, programs for potential dropouts, low-achievement level students, county jail inmates, the hospitalized emotionally disturbed, and occupational exposures for educable mentally retarded students.

Nineteen of the participants were involved in the development of teacher training programs, seven of them were involved with more than one. Many of the programs were in-service conferences, others were designed to meet the unique needs of innovative programs.

Thirty-one of the seminar participants shared their knowledge and understandings of persons with special needs with various educational groups and organizations through such media as speaking engagements, special presentations, etc. Eighteen of the participants had worked with more than one group; some with as many as eight. It is interesting to note the variety of individuals that was reached with these presentations. There were vocational and non-vocational teachers, local administrators, community organizations, news media, state educational authorities, institutions of higher learning, departments of correction, etc.

Another activity that was studied was the amount of participation in the organization of groups, committees, etc. that focused on persons with special needs. Twenty-one of the participants engaged in this activity. In some states, a special task force was formed, and there were numerous workshops and committees for teachers and state and local authorities.

Twenty-nine of the seminar participants disseminated information regarding the seminar and twenty-three attended conferences that focused on the problems of persons with special needs. Seven attended the National Conference on Persons with Special Needs held in Washington, D. C., February, 1968. Six attended the American Vocational Education Association sessions on persons with special needs in December, 1967.

Tables containing numbers present facts precisely and efficiently; they have become the most widely accepted form of data presentation. As a result, many interesting and often relevant details and human factors are lost in a maze of lines

and figures. Thus, ten individual case studies are presented in Appendix D.[9] Each study contains an account of a seminar participant's activities regarding persons with special needs during the year following the seminar. A total list of the individuals who participated in the follow-up survey appears in Appendix E.[10]

---

[9]Appendix D begins on Page 24.

[10]Appendix E, Page 42.

D. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the complete evaluation, it was concluded that the seminar created and maintained a favorable image of itself among the seminar participants, and more importantly influenced (to varying degrees) the future behavior of the participants to take positive action on behalf of persons with special needs.

It is believed that the objectives of the seminar were realistic and sound, and were satisfactorily reached during the twelve-month period of the project. However, one must realize that two weeks does not permit an in-depth exploration of any one topical area.

One of the major success ingredients of the seminar was the participants. In the opinion of the staff, the participants were an outstanding group of people. Regardless of the criterion on which one may choose to measure them, (be it enthusiasm, intelligence, cooperation, etc.) the results would suggest participants of superior quality. This outstanding group was the key to the seminar's success, and perhaps its most outstanding feature.

Although it was recognized that part of the criticism leveled against the seminar's form and content was legitimate, it is believed that it was the form and content that enabled the seminar to adequately reach its objectives.

The schedule, consisting of morning, afternoon, and evening sessions, seemed somewhat rigorous as the participants pointed out. Such a schedule leaves little to no time for informal "bull-sessions" with newly acquired colleagues. It also provided inadequate time for group project work. This type of work is very significant to a group such as this and adequate time for its functioning should have been allowed.

The above two scheduling problems received the major portion of the criticism leveled by the participants. The seminar staff recognizes its legitimacy.

From a more positive outlook, the seminar's content was seen as especially successful in presenting the characteristics of persons with special needs, the need for special techniques, materials and curricula for reaching persons with special needs,

guidelines for establishing special needs programs, and the potential contribution these individuals can make to society.

At this concluding point, one should return to the questions asked in the Section B-2. The seminar staff believes that the three questions should be answered in the affirmative.

1. The evaluation survey data suggested that the seminar participants benefitted professionally from attending the seminar.

2. On the basis of the answer obtained to the above question and the intrinsic satisfaction expressed on the part of the staff, the outcomes of the seminar did indeed justify the time and effort the seminar staff and host institution expended.

3. Did the outcomes of the seminar justify the financial and supervisory support provided by the U. S. Office of Education? The answer to this question can be provided by that office alone. However, the reactions of the majority of persons concerned with the project would suggest an affirmative answer here also.

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Questionnaire I

SEMINAR: PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

The seminar staff is interested in your reaction to the two-week seminar held at the University of Kentucky June 12-23, 1967. This questionnaire has been designed to assist in evaluating the seminar and in the planning of future seminars. Your assistance in this endeavor will be greatly appreciated.

Regarding the time alloted to the different activities of the seminar--which activities should have received more time or less time?

a. Formal presentations by consultants

____ greater amount of time
____ about the same amount of time
____ lesser amount of time

b. Discussion sessions with consultants

____ greater amount of time
____ about the same amount of time
____ lesser amount of time

c. Individual and group project work

____ greater amount of time
____ about the same amount of time
____ lesser amount of time

Many consultants were used during the seminar. Generally speaking (realizing the contribution varied with each consultant), do you consider their contribution:

____ of great value ____ of little value
____ of some value ____ of no value

APPENDIX A

Would you recommend:

____ more consultants and give them less time
____ about the same number of consultants
____ fewer consultants and give them more time

Several field trips were taken. Did you consider this activity:

____ of great value ____ of little value
____ of some value ____ of no value

Would you recommend:

____ more field trips
____ about the same number of field trips
____ fewer field trips

Would you advise a colleague to enroll in a similar seminar?

____ Yes ____ No

What do you consider the most valuable thing you learned during the seminar?

We would appreciate any additional comments about the seminar, and any suggestions that you may have for planning future seminars.

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Form A

University of Kentucky Research Foundation
Participant Follow-up Survey
Seminar: Persons With Special Needs

Name _____ Date _____

1. Are you working the same position that you were when you attended the seminar? ____ Yes ____ No

   If your response to Question No. 1 is no, complete the following set of questions.

   a. Is your new position associated (in any way) with serving persons with special needs? ____ Yes ____ No

   b. What is your new position, and what is the nature of your work?

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE DESIGNED TO SECURE INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR ACTIVITIES RELATING TO PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS THROUGHOUT THE PAST YEAR. IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT YOU NO DOUBT HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES OTHER THAN PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS; HOWEVER, RELATE ONLY THOSE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED REGARDING PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.

2. Have you developed or assisted with the development of programs (pilot, experimental, etc.) for persons with special needs? (Include ongoing activities) ____ Yes ____ No

APPENDIX B

List and briefly describe each program regardless of whether it was funded.

3. Have you developed or assisted with the development of teacher training programs focusing on persons with special needs (workshop, special course of study, etc.)? (Include ongoing activities) ____ Yes ____ No

List and briefly describe each program.

4. Have you shared your knowledge of persons with special needs through such media as speaking engagements, special presentations, etc? ____ Yes ____ No

To what groups?

5. Have you assisted with and/or promoted the organization of groups (committees, workshops, etc.) which focus on persons with special needs? ____ Yes ____ No

List which groups and the function of each.

6. Have you disseminated any information regarding persons with special needs? ____ Yes ____ No

To whom?

7. Have you attended any local, state, or national conferences focusing on persons with special needs? ____ Yes ____ No

What conferences? Where? When?

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANT FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Form B

University of Kentucky Research Foundation
Participant Follow-up Survey
Seminar: Persons With Special Needs

Name _____ Date _____

1. Are you working in the same position that you were when you attended the seminar? ____ Yes ____ No

   If your response to Question No. 1 is no, complete the following set of questions.

   a. Is your new position associated (in any way) with serving persons with special needs? ____ Yes ____ No

   b. What is your new position, and what is the nature of your work?

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE DESIGNED TO SECURE INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR ACTIVITIES RELATING TO PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS THROUGHOUT THE PAST YEAR. IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT YOU NO DOUBT HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES OTHER THAN PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS; HOWEVER, RELATE ONLY THOSE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED REGARDING PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.

2. Have you developed or assisted with the development of programs (pilot, experimental, etc.) for persons with special needs? (Include ongoing activities) ____ Yes ____ No

APPENDIX C

List and describe in some <u>detail</u> each program in which you have been involved, regardless of whether it was funded. Include in the description such items as whether or not it was funded, funding agency, stage of development, outcomes, etc. If it is possible, include supporting data such as copies of proposals, other documents pertinent to the program, etc.

3. Have you developed or assisted with the development of teacher training programs focusing on persons with special needs (workshop, special course of study, etc.)? (Include ongoing activities) ____ Yes ____ No

   List and describe in detail each program. Include in the description such items as whether the program was implemented, characteristics of the teachers served by the program, summary of the content of the program, etc. If it is possible, include supporting data such as copies of documents pertinent to the program, proposals, etc.

4. Have you shared your knowledge of persons with special needs through such media as speaking engagements, special presentations, etc? ____ Yes ____ No

   To what groups? Please include a summary of each presentation.

5. Have you assisted with and/or promoted the organization of groups (committees, workshops, etc.) which focus on persons with special needs? ____ Yes ____ No

   List which groups and the function of each. Include <u>all</u> significant activities that resulted from the formation of these groups.

6. Have you disseminated any information regarding persons with special needs? ____ Yes ____ No

   What types of information were disseminated? To whom?

7. Have you attended any local, state, or national conferences focusing on persons with special needs? ____ Yes ____ No

   What conferences? Where? When?

APPENDIX D

Duard E. Bayless; Supervisor, Vocational Agriculture; Chairman, Kentucky's Programs concerning Special Needs Training in Agriculture and Agriculture-related Businesses; 230 North Wilson Avenue; Morehead, Kentucky, 40351.

Mr. Bayless advanced to a new position which is definitely involved with persons with special needs. He became involved with the Kentucky State Programs for Special Needs Training in Agriculture and Agriculture-related Businesses.

Mr. Bayless developed a pilot program for special needs male students attending Fleming County High School. Since many of these boys could not read, they were taught mainly through work experience. Mr. Ed Allen, the Fleming County Vocational-Agriculture teacher, accepted the challenge for this unfunded program and because of its success, he has planned a second class (a new group) for the year 1968-69,even though his overload increased.

Mr. Bayless provided Mr. Allen with teaching materials, including a course of study for his special needs classes.

Requests for funds to develop a farm training class for adults who had been enrolled in a MDTA farm-training class were submitted but refused by the Director of Vocational Education. The purpose of the program was to provide these persons with basic education in conjunction with their production agriculture classes.

Knowledge acquired by Mr. Bayless was shared with his former agricultural staff, with some of the vocational-agricultural teachers of the Eastern District who were interested in developing special needs groups at their schools, and with TAP (Technical Action Panel for Eastern Kentucky).

Mr. Bayless helped promote his ideas to District Supervisors of vocational-agriculture by forming a committee to study special needs. One function was for each committee member to search for and locate possible sites for pilot programs involving persons with special needs in their respective districts.

APPENDIX D

(Mrs.) Bertha H. Bolden; Director of Health Occupations Education; Washington, D. C.

Although Mrs. Bolden has changed working positions in the past year, she still has the opportunity to assist with and plan programs for persons with special needs as well as share her abundance of knowledge concerning this area with others.

Mrs. Bolden became involved with a program at Sharpe Health School where new plans were being made for the physically disabled. Courses were being planned for training the mentally retarded to be clerks, switchboard operators, receptionists, etc.

In the Health Occupation Education programs, she helped establish plans for a diversified program wherein all students who had been ineligible for other programs (for example, persons who hadn't finished high school) could enter specific courses and programs geared toward health. A six-hour day was planned; half of the day would include courses, such as Personal, Family and Community Health, Psychology of Human Behavior, Vocational Adjustments, etc. The other half of the day would be devoted to students' special needs (for example, special work in communications skills).

Mrs. Bolden has been extremely willing to share with others her knowledge of persons with special needs. Those who have benefitted directly from her knowledge include:

-- Parent groups who have children needing special help
-- Community agency groups who have offered assistance for persons with special needs
-- School administrators who wish to better understand how and what to do to help these special students progress
-- Parents who are on welfare and wish to participate in vocational programs, such as the nurse assistant program
-- Instructors who found a need to help students in financial stress or emotional unbalance. Pamphlets and personal advice and help were most appreciated when offered by Mrs. Bolden to these instructors

APPENDIX D

Besides reading and actually becoming involved in programs, she attends conferences focusing on persons with special needs. Two she attended during the past year were the summer session on Special Needs in Curriculum Construction held at Colorado State University, and the National Special Needs Conference held in Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX D

(Miss) Amanda Cummings; Assistant Supervisor, Home Economics Education; Room 317; 156 Trinity Avenue, S. W.; Atlanta, Georgia.

During the past year, Miss Cummings has assisted with the development of new programs in occupational home economics. She also worked with the special problems encountered in the execution of these new programs.

As a result, six schools are now offering new programs: three in Food Service Occupations and three in Child Care Services. Funds for the programs were provided by the State Department of Education. It was felt that the programs were highly successful, since each person upon completion of the course became successfully employed or made plans for continuing his education or training for employment at a more advanced level.

During the year, Miss Cummings has also been active in assisting with the development of teacher training programs focusing on persons with special needs. Her assistance was given in planning and coordinating an occupational home economics workshop for in-service teachers held at Georgia College at Milledgeville, July 17-28, 1967. The overall purpose of the workshop was to prepare teachers to organize and conduct programs designed to increase the employability of pupils whose needs were not being met in existing school programs. Follow-up assistance was given through visits to schools, work centers, and work with teachers in individual and group conferences.

Assistance was also provided by Miss Cummings in the selection of resource persons and materials in planning an In-service Training Program under Title IV, Section 405, Public Law 88-352. The basic objective of this project was to provide in-service training in methods and content of family life education designed to provide new knowledge, skills and attitudes to aid in solving problems relating to desegregated classes. The project ran from August 15, 1967 through June 30, 1968.

Knowledge of persons with special needs was shared by Miss Cummings with supervisors of area vocational high schools.

She also took the time to present program suggestions and demonstrations to a group of teachers and leaders at Triad for Savannah, a youth conference which emphasized helping low-income families to keep nutrition up and food costs down. In addition to this, copies of her individual project (developed at the national seminar), and selected generalizations from the seminar guidelines were disseminated to state level vocational education personnel and area vocational high school personnel.

Miss Cummings attended several of the local vocational division staff conferences since many of them were centered around special needs programs in Georgia schools.

The Georgia Vocational Division of Education joined Miss Cummings in her concern for persons with special needs and they feel we should realize that work has been done in Agriculture Education, Business Education, Distributive Education, Multi-Service Programs, and Technical and Industrial Education.

APPENDIX D

Harlan L. Klintworth, MDTA Field Supervisor; 1 West Wilson Street; 720 State Office Building; Madison, Wisconsin, 53716.

Mr. Klintworth has been very active in developing programs for persons with special needs. One program, the Logger, All-Round-Sawmill Worker Program, concerned lumber mill workers in Menominee County. The basic purpose was to provide full-time, secure employment to thirty residents of Menominee County or within the immediate training area. This came through a coupled OJT program under RAR. On-the-job training was preceded by a 36-week period of institutional training. On completion of the institutional component, trainees entered into on-the-job training programs with private employers in the woods industry.

In the second program, the Concentrated Employment Program for ten Northwest Wisconsin counties, Mr. Klintworth and others set as their goal -- to bring an increasing number of unemployed and under-employed disadvantaged persons into the competitive labor market. The program was structured to provide a full range of employability services to those disadvantaged persons not functioning and/or producing up to their potential in the labor market.

In a third major project, the Basic Education Project at the Rice Lake Vocational - Technical School, Rice Lake, Wisconsin, the problem of illiteracy was dealt with in two ways. The first approach was one of offering a full-time educational program to persons over 18 years of age who functioned at less than the eighth grade level in the areas of reading, writing, spelling, speaking, and arithmetic. The second program was a part-time program involving the development and upgrading of reading proficiency for persons involved.

Besides the three major projects mentioned, Mr. Klintworth was involved with 49 regular Manpower Development and Training Act projects, eleven ARA projects, 370 JT projects which included related vocational instruction, and almost 400 trainees who entered public and private schools as slotters under MDTA.

Mr. Klintworth assisted with the development of two MDTA Teacher Education Workshops which were held in June of 1967. Along

with this, he has promoted the organization of groups and committees to develop MDTA programs.

The year beginning with June of 1967 was an extremely active one for Mr. Klintworth in the area of working with persons with special needs. He hasn't hesitated to progress and it is obvious why his state has been very pleased with his work.

APPENDIX D

Dr. Wendell L. Roy; Chairman, Faculty of Vocational-Technical Education; University of West Florida; Pensacola, Florida, 32504.

During the past year, many of Dr. Roy's efforts have been concentrated on the Pensacola Project which was executed for approximately 300 special needs junior high students from five selected schools. This project was funded with state and federal money and was to be initiated in September, 1968, in a technical school that was to be vacated. The University of West Florida became involved in planning toward the in-service preparation of teachers for incorporation into the Escambia County Project (Pensacola Project). The University was to hold a teacher training program, but it was not held because of the teachers' strike. Since the funding was to carry over for the fall of '68, Dr. Roy worked very hard with this project and hoped it would carry through.

Dr. Roy has shared his knowledge of persons with special needs through various means. At the Florida Industrial Arts Association Conference in Tampa, he gave a presentation to the executive board of the F.I.A.A. concerning the Kentucky Institute and Pensacola's plans to initiate a program.

He has spoken to and worked with the University of West Florida, Teacher Education College Faculty about the Escambia Program. His talks included presenting the projected outline, requesting their cooperation, and presenting the county officials with whom they would work in an effort to help students with special needs.

The steering committee, in charge of planning for schools for students with special needs, was extremely grateful to Dr. Roy for his assistance concerning plans for a structure to house the program, proposals to state and federal sources requesting funds, proposals to university and school officials for implementing the school, and proposals for obtaining and training teachers.

As was stated earlier, Dr. Roy was always anxious to share his knowledge of persons with special needs by either written or

spoken means. This is obvious by the fact that although he had spoken with many of the persons about the Kentucky Institute, he decided a written resume would be helpful for members of the following groups: (1) University of West Florida Administration, (2) University of West Florida School of Education, (3) Escambia County School Board and Administration, (4) Florida Industrial Arts Association, and (5) Escambia County Mental Health Association.

It is very obvious that Dr. Roy has been extremely busy with his work concerning persons with special needs and his enthusiasm is spreading throughout the state of Florida.

APPENDIX D

Dr. Robert A. Schultheis; Assistant Professor of Business Education; College of Education; Temple University; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Schultheis is presently working in the same position as he was at the time of the seminar. During the past year, he has been very active in helping promote and organize programs for persons with special needs.

For the summer of 1968, he planned an Institute for Business Teachers, hoping that through the institute, his original plan to develop a teacher education program for the training of business teachers to teach disadvantaged students might take form. Along this same line, Dr. Schultheis developed a master plan for state and individual school projects for mentally retarded youth; this came as a result of being a member of the Advisory Board for Youth with Special Needs in Vocational Education, State Education Department. In addition to these accomplishments, Recordkeeping Syllabus (a course for slow learners) was developed for the New York State Department of Education.

Along with directing the Institute for Business Teachers, Dr. Schultheis helped develop a business teacher education program for teachers of inner city youth at the Temple University Business Education Department. This program was to be tested in the near future.

Dr. Schultheis was frequently a consultant on the topic of persons with special needs. He attended conferences at Virginia State College, Temple University, and Rider College.

Groups and summary statements follow:

Groups	Summary Statements
1. Indiana Supervisors of Business Education, Indiana State Univ., Terra Haute	A rationale for teaching slow learners in Business Education including vocational potential for slow learners in office work.

APPENDIX D

2.	Virginia Business Teachers, Virginia State College, Petersburg.	Teacher hangups in teaching poor, black, ghetto students.
3.	Suffolk County Business Teachers, Long Island, N.Y.	Teacher hangups in teaching slow learners.
4.	Abington High School, Business Education Dept., Pennsylvania	Same as # 1.
5.	Rider College Conference on Disadvantaged Youth, Trenton, New Jersey	Gave keynote address.
5.	Three college courses (2 undergraduate and 1 graduate)	Special units on disadvantaged youth.

Aside from the personal appearances, Dr. Schultheis also compiled a report of the Temple Institute, two articles on slow learners, and an article reporting the conclusions of Temple's Institute to be published in National Business Education Form in February, 1969.

It is obvious that Dr. Schultheis has been one of our busiest seminar graduates and has done and is still doing much for persons with special needs.

APPENDIX D

Russell Tibbetts; Regional Supervisor, Manpower Development and Training Act (Assistant to Coordinator of MDTA); Department of Education; 721 Capitol Mall; Sacramento, California, 95814.

Mr. Tibbetts has changed positions during the past year and is now assisting the coordinator of MDTA. However, his new position is definitely related to serving persons with special needs.

He was involved for the past year with the initial projects training Mexican-Americans in basic education throughout the state of California. Through these projects, which were funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and Department of Labor, Mr. Tibbetts and other workers learned first-hand that people in different geographic regions, even of a state, differ widely and must be approached in different ways. He gained a tremendous amount of knowledge concerning persons with special needs. Mr. Tibbetts always took the opportunity to attend meetings such as the Second Annual Conference of the Mexican-American Political Association and meetings between the Mexican-American groups and federal and/or state agencies. He is willing to share proposals with others upon request.

The MDTA Unit with which Mr. Tibbetts is involved has been acting in an advisory capacity to the AMIDS program in California. This was an experimental program for the training of instructors supervisors and administrators to enhance the understanding of and sensitivity to the characteristic problems and needs of the disadvantaged including minorities, low-income workers, deprived youth, and those displaced from the labor market.

Mr. Tibbetts disseminated information regarding persons with special needs through the MDTA Unit. The assistant supervisors collected and forwarded information to the headquarters, and headquarters in turn replied to requests from the field for specialized information.

It is obvious that Mr. Tibbetts and the state of California have been very actively involved with persons with special needs.

APPENDIX D

Thomas C. Vinson; Instructor, Mechanical Engineering Division; State Technical Institute at Memphis; 5983 Macon Cove at I-40; Memphis, Tennessee.

Mr. Vinson's position has changed since the time of the seminar. Nevertheless, he has continued to be interested in persons with special needs and has promoted many good ideas in Tennessee. At the Special Needs Workshop, held at Middle Tennessee State University, Murfeesboro, Tennessee, August 7-11, 1967, he promoted the organization of groups which should focus on persons with special needs. Mr. Vinson served as a participant and a guest speaker, and in so doing helped carry out the theme -- Motivated Vocational Related Remedial Training. The workshop was sponsored by the Programs Service Section of the Tennessee State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Technical Education.

During the past year, Mr. Vinson has also disseminated information regarding persons with special needs at state workshops for persons with special needs on the high school level.

At the present time, Mr. Vinson hasn't had the opportunity to develop or assist in the development of programs for persons with special needs or teacher training programs focusing on this group, but he is still very interested in the program and its promotion in Tennessee.

APPENDIX D

(Miss) Florence E. Wagner; Supervisor, Division of Occupational Education Supervision; New York Department of Education; Albany, New York, 12224.

During the year following the institute at Kentucky, Miss Wagner developed or assisted with the development of approximately 30 different occupational education programs for persons with special needs, each of which was funded under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. These programs were carried out in various parts of the state.

Miss Wagner's position as supervisor also provided her with the opportunity to develop or assist with the development of teacher training programs focusing on persons with special needs. She worked on a project jointly proposed by the Department of Correction and the State University College at Oswego for Extending Vocational Education Competency in the Industrial Program of the Department of Correction. The purpose of this project was to provide training in (1) production analysis techniques and (2) shop analysis, to improve the vocational education program in correctional industrial services and in maintenance services of the Department of Correction. The appropriate courses of training were developed by the State University College of Oswego, with the assistance of the Department of Correction, and the training was administered and conducted by the college in accordance with the funds provided by the State Department of Education.

Also under the guidance of Miss Wagner was a two-week summer in-service training program for teachers who would be working with students with special needs in one of the Big Six Cities. The program was designed to create an awareness and understanding within teachers of students with special needs in an effort to obtain a better teacher-student relationship and instructional atmosphere. It was estimated that the program would cost $7,500.

Over the past year, the following groups have benefitted from Miss Wagner's vast amount of knowledge concerning persons with special needs:

APPENDIX D

-- Conference of NYS Federation of Chapters of Council for Exceptional Children, October 7, 1967
-- Conference of NYS Teachers of Educable Mentally Handicapped, November 3, 1967
-- Conference of Teachers of Home Economics Occupational Education, March 23, 1968
-- Conference of Area Occupational Education Directors, June 6, 1968

She was also a Resource Consultant to the Department's Curriculum Center in developing curriculum publications for persons with special needs in the areas of home economics, agriculture, and distributive education.

Other written information was provided to various groups and individuals by Miss Wagner. Information regarding the kinds of programs offered and the estimated numbers served was sent to State Department Personnel, State and U. S. Legislators, USOE representatives, out-of-state education department representatives, State Advisory Council, and other interested personnel. Special needs program development information was sent to district superintendents of schools, area directors of occupational education and other locally interested personnel of eleven area occupational education programs. Additional information was disseminated through numerous telephone and written communications.

Local, state and national conferences were a very important part of Miss Wagner's year. In addition to those listed above, Miss Wagner attended those listed below:

-- AVA, Cleveland, Ohio - 12/4-6/67
-- USOE National Conference on Programs-Persons with Special Needs, Washington, D. C. - 2/6-8/68
-- Governors Conference on Youth, New York City - 4/5/66

As anyone can see, Miss Wagner has been very active this past year.

APPENDIX D

John R. Wyllie; Director, Cooperative Education and Special Needs Programs; New Jersey Department of Education; 225 West State Street; Trenton, New Jersey, 08625.

Mr. Wyllie and his staff have been very actively involved in working with persons with special needs. Approximately twenty-six programs for persons with special needs were carried out. Twenty were funded with federal and state funds; six used federal and local support. An example would be the employment orientation program which consisted of (1) simple skill training and (2) a simulated work program. These programs served the following students: (1) socially or emotionally disturbed, (2) slow learners, and (3) mentally retarded. Their goal was to duplicate actual working conditions or operations.

Mr. Wyllie was in charge of a Special Needs Program Meeting on October 11, 1967. Pilot programs were described and some time was devoted to programs of Cooperative Industrial Education.

Mr. Wyllie and/or his staff developed a special needs workshop and from this came a program focusing on persons with special needs. The one-day Special Needs Workshop was held on June 7, 1968 and was initiated to inform those persons currently operating programs and those who would be starting programs for the school year 1968-69. Fifty-five interested persons attended and observed films, slides, and demonstrations of special needs programs in operation the past year. They also projected plans for a three-day workshop for the following year.

During the year, Mr. Wyllie and his staff have had many speaking engagements and thus, opportunities to share with others their knowledge of persons with special needs. Examples of groups spoken to are: a conference at Rutgers University, the Hunterdon County Chapter for Handicapped Children, small group meetings in comprehensive high schools, Sixteenth Annual Institute of the New Jersey Conference on the Handicapped, etc.

Mr. Wyllie has assisted with and/or promoted the organization of several groups which focus on persons with special needs. These include: the State Vocational Advisory Committee on Special Needs, Coordinators of Part-Time Employment Orientation Programs,

a group working with cooperative planning between education and rehabilitation, and the First National Meeting on Work Study.

During the Seminar for Special Needs at the University of Kentucky, Mr. Wyllie and Thomas McNulty developed a booklet based on New Jersey's pilot programs in occupational education for persons with special needs. This booklet, entitled A Program of Simulated Work and Basic Skills Training, was disseminated to various groups.

Local, state, and national conferences were another part of Mr. Wyllie's involvement. Those attended were the AVA Conference held in Cleveland, Ohio during December, 1967; the Special Needs Conference in Washington, D. C., in February, 1968; and the National Institute on Innovative Curriculums in Vocational-Technical Education held at Pennsylvania State University during July, 1968.

Mr. Wyllie and his staff have been actively involved in the special needs program in a state that considers their work very important. It is obvious they have a great amount of cooperation among various persons and departments.

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

Joseph Acosta	Stockton, California
Duard E. Bayless	Morehead, Kentucky
Bertha H. Bolden (Mrs.)	Washington, D. C.
Katharine F. Brown	Raleigh, North Carolina
J. P. Camp	Columbia, South Carolina
Dr. Anne Chase	Richmond, Kentucky
Walter L. Cox, Jr.	Raleigh, North Carolina
Leslie F. Crabbe	Columbus, Ohio
(Miss) Amanda Cummings	Atlanta, Georgia
Gordon H. Eddy	Marietta, Ohio
William R. Eister	Richmond, Virginia
Ruel F. Falk	Madison, Wisconsin
Addison S. Hobbs	Washington, D. C.
C. B. Jeter	Richmond, Virginia
Minnard H. Jones	St. Croix, Virgin Islands
Thomas R. Jones	Austin, Texas
Harlan L. Klintworth	Madison, Wisconsin
Dr. R. Charles Long	Petersburg, Virginia
Thomas F. McNulty	Trenton, New Jersey
(Mrs.) Betty Mackey	Bowling Green, Ohio
James E. Metcalf	Concord, New Hampshire
Charles Joseph Mitchell	Concord, New Hampshire
Michael M. Murphy	Charleston, West Virginia
Dr. Robert Lee Ogle	Richmond, Kentucky
Donald Raines	Clinchco, Virginia
Dr. Wendell L. Roy	Pensacola, Florida
Dr. Robert A. Schultheis	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Jerry Edward Shuck	Louisville, Kentucky
Thomas C. Swift	Tallahassee, Florida
Edward P. Tangman, Jr.	Albuquerque, New Mexico
Russell Tibbetts	Sacramento, California
James R. Vinson	Nashville, Tennessee
Thomas C. Vinson	Memphis, Tennessee
(Miss) Florence E. Wagner	Albany, New York
John R. Wyllie	Trenton, New Jersey
Michael A. Zockle	Warren, Ohio